



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,489	01/03/2006	Thomas Lederer	2003P07074WOUS	8264
22116 7590 07/28/2009 SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830				
EXAMINER				
TRAN, BANGLONG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2458				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,489

Applicant(s)

LEDERER ET AL.

Examiner

BANGLONG TRAN

Art Unit

2458

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 was canceled.
2. Claims 12-22 have been amended.
3. Claims 23-31 are new.
4. Claims 112-31 are pending.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 31 recited the term "objects" which appear to be lacking antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 12, 13, 24, 25, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger et al. (hereinafter Coppinger), U.S Publication No. 20040158607, in view of Fellenstein et al. (hereinafter Fellenstein), U.S Publication No. 20040073616.

8. As to claim 12, Coppinger discloses a method for processing of an electronic message comprising:

receiving an electronic message ([0018], lines 1-2, i.e., received an email), the electronic message comprised of at least one file attachment ([0018], lines 2-3);

saving the at least one file attachment in at a user-selected memory location ([0015], lines 10-14; [0020], lines 1-2).

Coppinger does not disclose

creating a link to the electronic message;

saving the link to the electronic message in the user-selected memory location.

However, Fellenstein discloses

creating a link to the electronic message ([0031], lines 10-11, i.e., by actuating the icon the replying message window containing original message will open);

saving the link to the electronic message in the user-selected memory location ([0031], lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger with the teaching of Fellenstein to have the features for creating a link to the electronic message and saving the link to the electronic message in the user-selected memory location. Because it would provide users an efficient method in which replies to originating electronic messages such as email are grouped together in a manner such that the replies may be selectively

accessed and presented together with a reference to the originating message for viewing by the sender of the original message ([Fellenstein: 0004]).

9. As to claim 13, Fellenstein discloses the link is created and saved such that the link is displayed in the same file as the file attachment ([0031], lines 18-21), the link configured to display the electronic message after the link is actuated ([0033], lines 3-9).

10. As to claim 24, Coppinger discloses the user-selected memory location is a hard disk of a telecommunications terminal ([0015], lines 10-14, i.e., network storage).

11. As to claim 25, Fellenstein discloses the link is a backlink ([0031], lines 10-11, i.e., by actuating the icon the replying message window containing original message will open).

12. As to claim 26, Coopinger discloses the user-selected memory location is a file of a file system ([0015], lines 13-14, i.e., remote storage location implicitly comprising folders or directories containing files of a file system such as NTFS or FAT), the file system stored on and/or maintained by an electronic device selected from the group consisting of computers, telecommunications terminals and networks ([0015], lines 13-14, network server 100 of Fig. 3).

13. Claims 14, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger and Fellenstein as applied to claims 12 and 13 above, in view of Dale W. Malik (hereinafter Malik), U.S Patent No. 6898622.

14. As to claim 14, Coppinger and Fellenstein disclose the invention as described in claims 12 and 13 above. They do not disclose the file attachment has a file name that is changed when the at least one file attachment is saved (column 4, lines 54-57).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger and Fellenstein with the teaching of Malik to have the file attachment has a file name that is changed when the at least one file attachment is saved. Because it would provide more convenient or appropriate to intended recipient of the attachment, also help users to avoid overwritten file which already existed in the storage.

15. As to claim 17, Coppinger and Fellenstein disclose the invention as described in claim 12 above. They do not disclose the at least one file attachment is saved according to a defined rule and/or in a set file structure. However, Malik discloses the file attachment is saved according to a defined rule and/or in a set file structure (column 5, lines 8-19).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger with the teaching of Malik to have the at least one file attachment is saved according to a defined rule and/or in a set file

structure. Because it would provide a better way to users in order to open the file attachment base on the type, size, location or date on which the file has been saved.

16. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger, Fellenstein and Malik as applied to claims 12-14 above, in view of Ken Miyashita (hereinafter Miyashita), U.S Publication No. 20030131062.

17. As to claim 15, Coppinger, Fellenstein, and Malik disclose the invention as described in claims 12-14 above. They do not disclose the message link is comprised of a name that is comprised of the changed file name. However, Miyashita discloses the message link is comprised of a name that is comprised of the changed file name ([0201], lines 4-8, i.e., changing the characters of the link indication implying changing name).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger, Fellenstein, and Malik with the teaching of Miyashita to have the message link comprising of a name that is comprised of the changed file name. Because it would provide users a proper method to allow an association between a file attached to an e-mail and a body of the e-mail to be clearly displayed (Miyashita: [0008]).

18. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Coppinger and Fellenstein as applied to claims 12-13 above, in view of Dale W. Malik (hereinafter Malik 7003551), U.S. Patent No. 7003551.

19. As to claim 16, Coppinger and Fellenstein disclose the invention as described in claims 12-13 above. They do not disclose the electronic message is an e-mail of an SMTP e-mail client. However, Malik 7003551 discloses the electronic message is an e-mail of an SMTP e-mail client (column 1, line 49-50).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger, Fellenstein with the teaching of Malik 7003551 to have the electronic message is an e-mail of an SMTP e-mail client. Because it is the easiest and fastest way to get email from one place to another, also SMTP is very popular, it is supported on many platforms by many vendors, has low implementation and administration costs.

20. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger and Fellenstien as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Miyashita

21. As to claim 23, Coppinger and Fellenstein disclose the invention as described in claim 12 above. They do not disclose replacing the at least one file attachment with at least one attachment link in the electronic message. However, Miyashita discloses replacing the at least one file attachment with at least one attachment link in the electronic message ([0201], lines 4-6).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 15 above.

22. Claims 18, 19, 27, 28, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger and Fellenstein, in view of Hiroaki Sakagawa (hereinafter Sakagawa), U.S Publication No. 20020091570.

23. As to claim 18, Coppinger discloses a device for user-based processing of at least one electronic message (Fig. 3, client computer 102; [0024], lines 1-2), the device comprising:

an e-mail client (Fig. 3, email client 114; [0024], lines 1-2) configured to receive at least one electronic message having a file attachment ([0018], lines 1-2);

an attachment substitution unit (Fig. 3, auto link user interface 108; [0024], lines 6-8) configured to replace a file attachment of a received electronic message with a memory location link ([0016], lines 7-11);

a user file system ([Fig. 3, local electronic storage device 110; [0024], lines 8-9) configured to store the file attachment ([0015], lines 10-14);

a control unit (Fig. 3, client computer 102; [0024], lines 1-2) configured to control the e-mail client, the attachment substitution unit, the message link insertion unit and the attachment insertion unit [0024].

Coppinger does not disclose

an attachment insertion unit configured to insert the replaced file attachment in a selected memory location in a file system; and

a message link insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the selected memory location, the message link referring to the electronic message.

However, Sakagawa discloses an attachment insertion unit (Fig.2 advertisement insertion unit 204; [0040], lines 4-6) configured to insert the replaced file attachment in a selected memory location in a file system ([0040], lines 4-6).

Coppinger and Sakagawa do not disclose

a message link insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the selected memory location, the message link referring to the electronic message.

However Fellenstein discloses

a message link insertion unit (Fig. 3, email application 301; [0025], lines 1-3) configured to insert a message link in the selected memory location ([0031], lines 16-18), the message link referring to the electronic message ([0031], lines 10-11, i.e., by actuating the icon the replying message window containing original message will open).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger, Fellenstein with the teaching of Sakagawa to have

an attachment insertion unit configured to insert the replaced file attachment in a selected memory location in a file system; and

a message link insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the selected memory location, the message link referring to the electronic message.

Because it would provide users an easier way to users to insert document into the email, a document could be a word document, in this case it would help users to

save time without retyping the document into the email. Also provide users an efficient method in which replies to originating electronic messages such as email are grouped together in a manner such that the replies may be selectively accessed and presented together with a reference to the originating message for viewing by the sender of the original message ([Fellenstein: 0004]).

24. As to claim 19, Fellenstein discloses the link is created and saved such that the link is displayed in the same file as the file attachment ([0031], lines 18-21), the link configured to display the electronic message after the link is actuated ([0033], lines 3-9).

25. As to claim 27, Coppinger discloses the message link is a backlink ([0031], lines 10-11, i.e., by actuating the icon the replying message window containing original message will open).

26. As to claim 28, Coppinger discloses the user-selected memory location is a file of a file system ([0015], lines 13-14, i.e., remote storage location implicitly comprising folders or directories containing files of a file system such as NTFS or FAT), the file system stored on and/or maintained by an electronic device selected from the group consisting of computers, telecommunications terminals and networks ([0015], lines 13-14, network server 100 of Fig. 3).

27. As to claim 29 Fellenstein discloses message link insertion unit is configured to insert a message link in the selected memory location such that the link is displayed in the same file as the file attachment ([0031], lines 18-21), the link configured to display the electronic message after the link is actuated ([0033], lines 3-9).

28. Claims 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa as applied to claims 18-19 above, in view of Miyashita

29. As to claim 20, Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa disclose the invention as described in claims 18-19 above. They do not disclose the message link is comprised of a file name of the inserted file attachment. However, Miyashita discloses the message link is comprised of a file name of the inserted file attachment ([0201], lines 4-6).

The motivation of this claims is as same as the one of claim 15 above.

30. As to claim 21, Coppinger, Fellenstein, and Sakagawa disclose the invention as described in claim 18 above. They do not disclose the attachment insertion unit is configured to file the replaced file attachment using a modified file name ([0201], lines 4-8, i.e., changing the characters of the link indication implying modified file name).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 15 above.

31. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa as applied to claims 18 and 21 above, in view of Malik.

32. As to claim 22, Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa disclose the invention as described claim 18 and 21 above. They do not disclose the attachment insertion unit files the replaced file attachment according to a user-define rule and/or a user-define file structure. However, Malik discloses the attachment insertion unit files the replaced file attachment according to a user-define rule and/or a user-define file structure (column 5, lines 8-19).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 17 above.

33. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa as applied to claim 18 above, in view of Cherkasova et al. (hereinafter Cherkasova), U.S Publication No. 20050076111.

34. As to claim 30, Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa disclose the invention as described in claim 18 above. They do not disclose the backlink generation means. However, Cherkasova discloses the backlink generation means ([0049], lines 26-27).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger, Fellenstein and Sakagawa with the teaching of Cherkasova to have the backlink generation means. Because it would

provide users a proper for relating aborted client accesses of server information to the quality of service provided to clients by a server in a client-server network (Cherkasova: [0011]).

35. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppinger, Fellenstein, in view of Irlam et al. (hereinafter Irlam), U.S Publication No. 20060155808.

36. As to claim 31, Coppinger discloses a device for processing of at least one electronic message (Fig. 3, client computer 102; [0024], lines 1-2), the device comprising:

an e-mail client (Fig. 3, email client 114; [0024], lines 1-2) configured to receive at least one electronic message having a file attachment ([0018], lines 1-2);

a user file system ([Fig. 3, local electronic storage device 110; [0024], lines 8-9) configured to store the file attachment in a file of a file system ([0015], lines 10-14);

a control unit (Fig. 3, client computer 102; [0024], lines 1-2) configured to control the e-mail client and the message link insertion unit [0024].

Coppinger does not disclose

a display device configured to display objects stored in the file of the file system when the file is accessed by a user;

a message link insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the file of the file system such that the message link is displayed adjacent to the file attachment after

the file is accessed by a user, the message link referring to the electronic message such that the electronic message is displayed when the message link is actuated.

However, Fellenstein discloses

a message link insertion unit (Fig. 3, email application 301; [0025], lines 1-3) configured to insert a message link in the file of the file system ([0031], lines 16-18); the message link referring to the electronic message such that the electronic message is displayed when the message link is actuated ([0033], lines 3-9).

Coppinger and Fellenstein do not disclose

a display device configured to display objects stored in the file of the file system when the file is accessed by a user;

a message link insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the file of the file system such that the message link is displayed adjacent to the file attachment after the file is accessed by a user

However, Irlam discloses

a display device (Fig. 5A, web server 523; [0046], lines 4-5) configured to display objects stored in the file of the file system when the file is accessed by a user ([0046], lines 5-8, i.e., summary of quarantined messages and attachments implying objects);

the message link is displayed adjacent to the file attachment after the file is accessed by a user ([0046], lines 5-8, link and attachments are saved in the same place).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Coppinger and Fellenstein with the teaching of Irlam to have

a display device configured to display objects stored in the file of the file system when the file is accessed by a user;

a message link insertion unit configured to insert a message link in the file of the file system such that the message link is displayed adjacent to the file attachment after the file is accessed by a user, the message link referring to the electronic message such that the electronic message is displayed when the message link is actuated.

Because it would provide users an efficient method in which replies to originating electronic messages such as email are grouped together in a manner such that the replies may be selectively accessed and presented together with a reference to the originating message for viewing by the sender of the original message ([Fellenstein: [0004]]). Also providing a proper method for enrolling users of an e-mail entity in an electronic messaging service in which electronic messages are delivered from sending servers to destination servers through electronic message delivery paths (Irlam: [0011]).

Response to Arguments

37. The Examiner respectfully withdraws 35 U.S.C rejections for claims 14 and 15.

38. The applicant's argument includes new limitations amended to the claims, new arts have been introduced.

Accordingly, the Examiner maintains the rejection.

Conclusion

39. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **BANGLONG TRAN** whose telephone number is (571)270-3931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m.-5:00p.m, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Avellino can be reached on (571)272-3905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2458

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2458